

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1-32 were pending in the above-identified application. Claims 33-36 have been previously canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-20, 22-26, 28-29 and 31-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton U.S. patent No. 6,014,643 (hereinafter "Minton") in view of Robertson et al. European patent application No. 0 665 489 A2 (hereinafter "Robertson"). The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton and Robertson and in further view of Hawkins et al. U.S. patent No. 6,247,000 (hereinafter "Hawkins"). The Examiner rejected claims 9, 12, 27 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton and Robertson and in further view of Harrington et al. U.S. patent No. 6,161,099 (hereinafter "Harrington").

Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 13-15, 17, 19, 20, 31 and 32 to more clearly define the claimed invention. Applicants have canceled claims 5, 7, 16, 18, 23 and 25 and have added new claims 37-62. No new subject matter has been added and the amendments to the claims are fully supported by

the specification. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

II. Applicants' Response to the Claim Rejections

A. Summary of independent claims 1 and 19

Applicants' independent claims 1 and 19 are directed to systems and methods for submitting trade commands in an electronic trading system.

More particularly, amended claims 1 and 19 specify, among other things, receiving a submission of a bid or buy command from a trader via a first interface - e.g., an entry interface. In response to this submission, a second interface - e.g., a trading interface - is presented for confirming the command entered by the trader. The command is submitted in response to the trader confirming the submission via the second interface. The second interface is the same interface that would be presented in response to a submission of an offer or sell command. In other words, the same second interface is displayed regardless of whether the type of command that is submitted via the first interface is a bid or buy order, or an offer or sell order. For example, the

interface that is displayed in response to a trader submitting a buy command is the same as the one that is displayed in response to the trader submitting a sell command. Although the second interface does not depend on the submitted command, the information populating the fields in that interface may depend on it. For example, the second interface may include price and/or size fields that are populated with the price and/or size submitted via the first interface.

B. The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

i. The rejection of claims
1-2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-20, 22-26, 28-29 and 31-32

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-20, 22-26, 28-29 and 31-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton in view of Robertson. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner maintains that Minton and Robertson, taken together, disclose all the features of applicants' independent claims 1 and 19. However, applicants respectfully

Appl. No. 09/745,651
Reply dated November 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 16, 2005

submit that neither Minton nor Robertson shows or suggests all the features of claims 1 and 19, as amended.

Minton relates to a data processing system that allows an individual to enter an offer to buy or sell a security using a first screen (trading screen 400), select a particular security through a second screen (pricing screen 500) and either confirm an order to buy the security through a third screen (buy screen 600) or confirm an order to sell the security through a fourth screen (sell screen 700).

Robertson merely relates to a system that automatically repositions a cursor at a determined location on a computer display when, for example, a new window is opened in response to a command being entered.

Applicants submit that neither Minton nor Robertson shows or suggests all the features of each of amended claims 1 and 19. More specifically, applicants submit that neither Minton nor Robertson shows or suggests presenting an interface in response to a submission of a bid or buy command, where the interface is the same interface that would be displayed in response to an offer or sell command.

Minton discloses two separate and distinct confirmation screens: 1) buy screen 600 for confirming an order to buy a security, and 2) sell screen 700 for confirming an order to sell a security. Each one of screens 600 and 700 relates to only one of buying or selling a security. (Minton, col. 10, line 54 through col. 12, line 42) This is in stark contrast to applicants' claimed invention. That is because, unlike the different screens disclosed in Minton, applicants' claimed invention specifies presenting the same second interface in response to a submission of a bid or buy command as well as a submission of an offer or sell command.

For example, the interface that is displayed in response to a trader submitting a buy command is the same as the one that is displayed in response to the trader submitting a sell command according to applicants' claimed invention. Minton, on the other hand, refers to displaying buy screen 600 (which is not the same as sell screen 700) for confirming an order to buy a security. Therefore, unlike applicants' claimed invention, the interface that is displayed in response to a trader submitting a bid or buy command is not the same as

Appl. No. 09/745,651
Reply dated November 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 16, 2005

the one that is displayed in response to the trader submitting an offer or sell command according to Minton.

Accordingly, Minton does not show or suggest applicants' improvement of allowing for the confirmation of a submission of a particular bid or buy command via the same interface that is presented in response to the submission of an offer or sell command. Robertson is limited to controlling the position of a cursor on a computer display and also does not show or suggest applicants' aforementioned improvement.

Because neither Minton nor Robertson, taken together or separately, shows or suggests all the features of each of amended independent claims 1 and 19, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 19 are allowable over Minton and Robertson.

Because claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10-11, 13-15 and 17 depend from claim 1, and claims 20, 22, 24, 26, 28-29 and 31-32 depend from claim 19, applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also allowable over Minton and Robertson for at least the same reasons as the independent claims. Applicants have canceled claims 5, 7, 16, 18, 23 and 25 and reserve the right to pursue these claims in one or more

Appl. No. 09/745,651
Reply dated November 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 16, 2005

continuing application. Applicants therefore request that the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-20, 22-26, 28-29 and 31-32 be withdrawn.

ii. The rejections of claims
claims 3, 9, 12, 21, 27 and 30

The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton and Robertson and in further view of Hawkins. The Examiner rejected claims 9, 12, 27 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton and Robertson and in further view of Harrington. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have demonstrated that claims 1 and 19 are allowable. Because claims 3, 9 and 12 depend from allowable claim 1, and claims 21, 27 and 30 depend from allowable claim 19, applicants respectfully submit that claims 3, 9, 12, 21, 27 and 30 are allowable. Applicants therefore request that the rejections of claims 3, 9, 12, 21, 27 and 30 be withdrawn.

III. New Claims 37-62

Claims 37-62 have been added and are fully supported by the specification. Each of independent claims 37 and 51 includes subject matter that is similar to the subject matter in independent claims 1 and 19, respectively.

More specifically, amended claims 37 and 51 specify, among other things, receiving a submission of an offer or sell command from a trader via a first interface - e.g., an entry interface. In response to this submission, a second interface - e.g., a trading interface - is presented for confirming the command entered by the trader. The command is submitted in response to the trader confirming the submission via the second interface. The second interface is the same interface that would be presented in response to a submission of a bid or buy command. In other words, like claims 1 and 19, the same second interface is displayed regardless of whether the type of command that is submitted via the first interface is a bid or buy order, or an offer or sell order.

Accordingly, while claims 1 and 19 specify receiving a submission of a *bid or buy* command via a first interface and presenting a second interface that is the same interface that

would be presented in response to a submission of an *offer or sell* command, claims 37 and 51 specify receiving a submission of an *offer or sell* command via a first interface and presenting a second interface that is the same interface that would be presented in response to a submission of a *bid or buy* command. Applicants have demonstrated that the art relied upon by Examiner does not show or suggest applicants' improvement of allowing for the confirmation of a submission of a particular bid or buy command via the same interface that is presented in response to the submission of an offer or sell command, as specified in claims 1 and 19. Therefore, that same art does not show or suggest allowing for the confirmation of a submission of a particular offer or sell command via the same interface that is presented in response to the submission of a bid or buy command, as specified in claims 37 and 51. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent claims 37 and 51 are allowable. Because claims 38-50 depend from claim 37, and claims 52-62 depend from claim 51, applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims.

Appl. No. 09/745,651
Reply dated November 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 16, 2005

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that new claims 37-62 are allowable.

IV. Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance. Entry of the amendments and a favorable action are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hassan Albakri
Limited Recognition No. L0013
Agent for Applicants
Fish & Neave IP Group
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
Tel.: (212) 596-9000